ntegrator

EDITORIAL SECTION

INCORPORATION, LICENSING, FREEDOM OF THE PRESS, ETC.

We have been accused of, among other things, carrying out vendettas against ICRN and WNTC.

Not once have we taken a stand on the issue of the incorporation

of ICRN, and/or the licensing of WNTC.

At this time, we will. In principle, we favor WNTC's obtaining a license, and we favor the license being held by a "not-for-profit," independent corporation. We believe that all student-community media (including this newspaper) would be better off, not controlled by the college or student government. (Of course, that is not quite the motivation of ICRN and Gary Landrio).

We have simply raised questions and pointed out some inconsistencies, as any newspaper would do. If such questions are not straightened out, they might block the attainment of the goal of incorporation and/or licensing.

Unfortunately, the ICRN board members (see letter to the editor) believe that we are wrong to do as we have done, which raises an entirely different issue.

One purpose of the Integrator, as stated in our constitution, is "to report news and items of interest to the college community." That certainly is not astounding, and should be taken for granted. But the ICRN board members, although supposedly working for the "benefit of the... joint campuses," do not think their efforts should be made known to the joint campuses. How modest.

They say we are trying to "create a sparring match" for our readers. We are simply trying as our constitution directs us, "to provide members of the college community at Clarkson College of Technology with a medium for free inquiry, free expression, and free debate."

The purposes of the Integrator that we have cited are elementary journalistic principles. It is frightening that others in the communications area would attempt to suppress them, or want them suppressed, especially when they are "honored journalists" themselves. (Or is Pi Delta Epsilon just another social fraternity?).

ROUND TWO

To the Editor:

In reply to Ms. Dooley's letter concerning the Inter-College Radio Network's research into the possibility of WNTC acquiring a free radiating license from the FCC:

Many of the points Ms. Dooley raised were questions of importance to both colleges as well as Potsdam's student population. These will be answered in the following letter.

Before these are answered, we would like to state our concern over the trend of her letter and the format in which the editor(s) of the integrator placed it.

First, we question Ms. Dooley's intentions. Her letter degenerated into a personal war between herself, Gary Landrio, and the future of an ICRN member station, WNTC.

In the opinion of the ICRN Board, as for Mr. Landrio's skills, he has done an excellent job of research for ICRN into the different possibilities for the program. He has been putting a great deal of time and energy into the project since January, 1973. That is approximately eight months of intensive research before the project was proposed to the student governments of both schools. We are sure that any station or network would appreciate his talents when he decides to apply them to a career.

Secondly, we beg to differ with Ms' Dooley's analysis of WNTS's capabilities of survival. Not having first ahnd knowledge of the present staffing and training programs of WNTC, we feel she is not qualified to make such judgments. For the past 25 years, WNTC has functioned as the leading campus radio station in Potsdam. Today its closest commercial competitor does not come close in attaining the college audience that WNTC does. Of the campus stations, WNTC has the largest audience.

As for re-staffing: any college organization has this problem to face. We have 25 years experience at doing it. Its been done for the past 25 years consistently and the product has consistently improved. Ms. Dooley did not take into account the 20 students that attended the State recruitment meeting. Eleven plus the twenty equals thirty-one.

Finally, we question the Integrator's titling of Ms. Dooley's letter.

Continued on page 5

etters

ROUND TWO

Continued from page 4

We know Ms. Dooley did not request that title. Is the Integrator trying to create a sparring match for its readers at the expense of ICRN?

As far as the implication that our advertising has made no difference to a major account and that their business continued to boom after they discontinued advertising, we should point out that this establishment was new in Potsdam and was unheard of until they advertised on WNTC. As a result of our advertising this establishment is now a household word in Potsdam, and further advertising was no longer deemed necessary by the management. However, this establishment has advertised with us in the summer and continues to advertise periodically during the school year.

It is conservative to estimate that WNTC can make \$20,000 after a couple of years as a free radiating station, based on the fact that WVBR in 1972, operating approximately as WNTC would be operated, made over \$100,000 in advertising income.

The purposes for ICRN are to provide the students and all those in the region of the Associated Colleges of the Saint Lawrence Valley, with public services, audio and video entertainment not normally available in this region. Such facilities are to provide educational instruction and social activity for the students in the area, and as such provide an introduction into broadcasting.

The details as to the terms of the proposed loan are best not to be formulated until the time of financing because of changing financial markets.

Concerning the equipment, all that is now in the main studio of WNTC is owned fully by CCSA. This is the vital part of WNTC's broadcasting equipment. All other than that which is in the main studio is owned at least 60% by CCSA.

Sources for grants that are now being approached include economic development agencies and foundations.

The issue of ICRN Inc. was never intended to be a platform for public debate and personal vendettas by credulous individuals not directly involved in the incorporation proceedings. There are some issues best left to ICRN board members, CCSA and SGA officers in cooperation with college administrators, and the Federal Communications Commission. The issue of ICRN Inc. is one of these. Instead of nitpicking for reasons why it will never work, we should all make a concerted effort to work for the mutual benefit of the ICRN member stations, the joint campuses, and the Potsdam community.

Richard McDermott, Station Mgr. WNTC William H. Thornton, ICRN Bd. Pres. Curtis M. Colopy, ICRN Bus. Mgr. William E. Ferguson, Station Mgr., WTSC

Editor's note: Perhaps this will just be some more "nitpicking," but first, why do you differentiate between "both colleges" and "Potsdam's student population"? Are you implying that the latter is not a part of the former?

Second, why do you state that the questions Ms.Dooley raised are of importance to students, and later that the issue was never meant for public debate by those not directly involved in the incorporation procedures?

Third, why do you refer to people who have raised questions as "credulous," when credulous people are those who blindly accept everything WITHOUT questioning?

Fourth, since you characterize Ms. Dooley's letter as a "personal war" between herself, Gary Landrio, and WNTC, how could you possibly object to the titling of her letter (Doeley's. WNTC...)?

Fifth, how can you bark up you selected that WNTC has the largest audience? To our knowledge, the largest audience state was ago. Land the largest two years ago. Land the largest large year was active.

Mistal large year was active.

Mistal large knowled; with the largest was an amilition to large year and active.

Manual was an amilition to large years who did got at large.

that, defense of ourselves, and further quantities and meters, please refer to the editorial segment.